# EURIPIDES

## FRAGMENTS

### Oedipus–Chrysippus

### Other Fragments

*Edited and Translated by*

CHRISTOPHER COLLARD
AND MARTIN CROPP

# APPENDIX:
# CRITIAS OR EURIPIDES?

# *PIRITHOUS, RHADAMANTHYS, TENNES*, and a *SISYPHUS*(?)

*TrGF* I 43 Critias T 1–4, F 1–21, with Addenda in *TrGF* $1^2$ (1986), 341–5 (chiefly F 4a) and *TrGF* 5.1107–8 (chiefly F 20a); cf. B. Gauly in *Musa Tragica* 108–25 (with Kannicht's participation). Earlier, Critias 88 B 10–29 DK; A. M. Battegazzore in Battegazzore and M. Untersteiner, *Sofisti. Testimonianze e Frammenti IV* (1962), 274–317; see also under *Pirithous* and *Sisyphus* below.[1]

Wilamowitz, *Analecta* 159, 161–6, *Kleine Schriften* IV.534 (orig. 1907), 446–7 (orig. 1927), 481–2 (orig. 1929), and a letter of 1907 responding to Kuiper (see bibl. for *Pirithous* below), published by J. M. Bremer and W. M. Calder III, *Mnemosyne* 47 (1997), 179–81, 211–6; A. Lesky, *Die tragische Dichtung der Hellenen* (Göttingen, $1972^3$), 525–6; D. V. Panchenko, *Vestnik Drevnei Istorii* 151 (1980), 144–62; B. Gauly in *Musa Tragica*, 108–9; Pechstein 289–319 with bibliography, and in Krumeich

[1] Nauck in 1889 assigned the then known fragments of *Pirithous*, *Rhadamanthys* and *Tennes* to Euripides, and the *Sisyphus* fragment to Critias along with those ascribed to him without play titles. Jouan and Van Looy excluded the four plays altogether from their Budé edition of Euripides (see ed. Budé VIII.1.xv).

(1999), 552–5; C. Collard, *Tragedy, Euripides and Euripideans* (Exeter, 2007), 55–68 (orig. 1995) with bibliography.

These four fragmentary plays are attributed in modern editions to the intellectual Critias, a slightly younger associate of Socrates who was politically active in the last years of Euripides' life; he became notorious as one of the 'Thirty Tyrants' who briefly controlled Athens under Spartan rule in 404–3, and was killed resisting overthrow in 403. Some scholars however follow the majority of ancient sources in attributing the plays to Euripides.

I. THE EVIDENCE. *Sisyphus* and *Tennes* appear among Euripides' plays in the papyrus collection of hypotheses P. Oxy. 2455, and in the list of play titles P. Oxy. 2456 (see *TrGF* 5.60, T 8; the part of this list which might have contained *Pirithous* and *Rhadamanthys* is missing). A *Sisyphus* by Euripides is known as part of his production of 415 (see under *Sisyphus* above), and is listed in the damaged Piraeus catalogue inscription (see *TrGF* 5.58–9, T 7a); *Pirithous* may perhaps have stood there also where only an initial P remains (no entries for R or T survive)

The following fragments are attributed in the sources to Euripides: *Pirithous* F 1 (hypothesis and text), 3, 4, 6, 10, 12–14 (F 2 is attributed uncertainly to Euripides or Critias, F 11 simply to a *Pirithous*; F 4a, 5 and 7–9 are from a single papyrus without attribution, but F 4a and 5 are clearly from a play featuring Pirithous); *Rhadamanthys* F 15 (hypothesis) and F 16–18; *Tennes* F 20 (hypothesis) and F 21 (in F 20a, a myth summary, Euripides may have been named as a poet who told Tennes' story). The sole source of the *Sisyphus* fragment as a whole (F 19) attri-

butes it to Critias (without a play title), but some lines from it are elsewhere attributed to Euripides, and their speaker named as Sisyphus.

Against Euripidean authorship of *Pirithous*, *Rhadamanthys* and *Tennes* is the statement in the ancient *Life of Euripides* (see *TrGF* 5.47, T 1.IA(9)) that these three plays are not authentically his—but no alternative author is named.

The following are attributed to Critias: *Pirithous* F 2 (to Critias or Euripides, see above), *Sisyphus* F 19 as a whole (see above), and four fragments cited without attribution to any play (Critias F 22–25).[2] It is inferred from Plato, *Critias* 108b and *Charmides* 162d (Critias T 1a and 1b in *TrGF*) that Critias composed for the tragic theatre.

Further major considerations may be briefly listed: *(a)* Only one other play named *Pirithous* is known, by Euripides' contemporary Achaeus (a single two-word fragment survives, *TrGF* 20 F 36). No other *Rhadamanthys* or *Tennes* is known. *(b)* The survival of papyrus fragments of narrative hypotheses and/or texts of *Pirithous*, *Rhadamanthys* and *Tennes* favours Euripides rather than any other poet, given his huge preponderance among papyrus fragments of tragedy. *(c)* The compatibility with Euripidean practice of some features of vocabulary, style and metre

[2] F 22? (= 2 N): 'Time has a remedy for all anger.' F 23 (= 3 N): 'The man who in associating with his friends does everything to gratify them, makes their immediate pleasure into enmity for time to come' (see further under *Pirithous*, Other Ascriptions). F 24 (= 4 N): 'It is dreadful when a man without sense thinks he is sensible.' F 25 (= 5 N): 'It is better to have wealth and its stupidity share one's home than poverty with its wisdom.'

in the fragments is disputed. *(d)* The compatibility with Euripidean thought and expression of some philosophical and 'metaphysical' concepts in *Pirithous* F 3 and 4 is disputed. *(e)* Since Euripides did write a satyric *Sisyphus*, the most debated questions are whether F 19 should be attributed to him, and to this known play, rather than to a *Sisyphus* by Critias for which there is no evidence at all, and whether the atheistic character of F 19 is consistent with Euripides' reputed atheism (rather than Critias's), as perceived in antiquity and mentioned in the sources which attribute parts of this fragment to Euripides, and consistent with satyric style and ethos overall.

II. SUMMARY DISCUSSION. The attribution of all four plays to Critias stems from repeated insistence by Wilamowitz between the years 1875 and 1929. He put the statement in the ancient *Life* of Euripides that '*Tennes*, *Rhadamanthys* and *Pirithous* are inauthentic' alongside the ancient attribution of a satyric *Sisyphus* and its two surviving fragments to Euripides, and of the *Sisyphus* fragment (without play title) to Critias. In a theory of magisterial economy, he declared that Critias had composed a tetralogy consisting of all four plays, in which *Sisyphus* was satyric; because Critias almost disappeared from the record after his infamous career and death, the entire tetralogy became associated with Euripides;[3] Alexandrian scholars (echoed in the *Life*) had tried to correct this false

[3] Although unconvinced by Wilamowitz's argument, Gauly 109 well observes that such a transfer of all four plays into the Euripidean corpus might explain why so many of the fragments are attributed to him, and why narrative hypotheses to *Pirithous, Rhadamanthys* and *Tennes* have surfaced under his name.

attribution, and we should respect them, given the general care and accuracy of their information. Wilamowitz claimed that *Pirithous*, *Rhadamanthys* and the *Sisyphus* fragment are inconsistent with Euripides' style and thought. He also contended that the very fewness of the dramatic fragments ascribed to Critias strengthened his case: 'the less well attested author is likely to be the true one'. Lastly, he supposed that the two very brief fragments of Euripides' *Sisyphus* (F 673–4) were wrongly attributed, possibly through a miscopying of the title of the similarly satyric *Syleus*, or that the play itself is entirely lost.

The chief aspects of the dispute are as follows: *(a)* *Pirithous*, *Rhadamanthys* and *Tennes* are linked only in the *Life*'s statement that they are not authentically Euripidean; their association with one another, and with the *Sisyphus* fragment at all, let alone all together in a tetralogy by Critias, was and remains purely hypothetical, despite the uncertain attribution of *Pirithous* F 2 to both poets. So long as we do not know why some Alexandrian scholar(s) disqualified the three plays for Euripides, their status is best regarded as uncertain. *(b)* Can the huge preponderance of attributions of the three named plays to Euripides (both hypotheses and book fragments) be set aside, especially when there is so little evidence that Critias wrote tragedy at all, and when the only play named as his is *Pirithous*, in the disputed attribution of F 2? *(c)* Judgments on matters of language, metre and thought which disqualify Euripides as author of the three plays (chiefly Wilamowitz, Panchenko) will always be contested (see Kuiper and Page on *Pirithous*, and Pechstein), but their attribution to Critias does not follow in any case; and Critias' authorship of the *Sisyphus* fragment has been contested on the

same grounds (Davies, Pechstein). One particular argument against Euripides' authorship of this fragment is the occurrence within its 42 verses of two certain instances of verse enjambement through a final prepositive word (13, 27) and one doubtful one (18): there are barely more than half-a-dozen instances of this phenomenon in dialogue in the whole of Euripides' surviving work.[4] *(d)* Scholarship remains evenly divided, whether the 'atheistic' *Sisyphus* fragment is compatible with Euripides' thought: Battegazzore, Winiarczyk and Obbink deny it; Dihle, Scodel and Pechstein accept it; Davies reached no conclusion.[5] *(e)* If all four plays are 'returned' to Euripides, how is it explicable that some parts of them were attributed to Critias? Would the four unassigned book fragments (F 22–25) be plausibly the only survival of his dramatic activity?

In sum, Lesky's reserve about Wilamowitz's theory looks more and more sensible. Collard has shown how overwhelming was the testimony for Euripidean authorship, and that it should be respected (while retreating a little in 2007 for the *Sisyphus* fragment on the ground of

[4] This consideration was first advanced by Dover, some years before his separate discussion of *Pirithous*, but it is not conclusive: *ὅπως* = 'so that' with enjambement (v. 13) has seven clear parallels in Euripides (including *Telephus* F 738; also = 'like' in F 971). *ἵνα* with enjambement (v. 27) has no parallel in Euripides, but five in Sophocles and four in *Prometheus Bound*. *τε καὶ* ending v. 27 is unparalleled in Euripides (four times in Sophocles), but is in a probably interpolated and also corrupt passage.

[5] Features of the plot and dramaturgy of *Pirithous* which seem to bear on the dispute are mentioned below in the Introduction to that play.

metre). It seems best to conclude that on the evidence at present available the question of authorship must remain unresolved; so too the question whether the *Sisyphus* fragment was satyric, and whether it may after all belong, if not to Euripides' known *Sisyphus*, then perhaps to another of his satyr plays such as *Autolycus A* (Pechstein, 1999; cf. P. Cipolla [bibl. for *Sisyphus* below], 247–68).

# PIRITHOUS

*TrGF* 1 43 Critias F 1–14, with F 4a in Vol. 1² (1986), 349–51; B. Gauly in *Musa Tragica* 109–20; Battegazzore (1962: see general bibl. above), 280–305 and in Battegazzore and others, *Corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini* 1* (1989), 442–66; Diggle, *TrGFS* 173–5 (F 1, 4a, 5, 7); G. Alvoni, *Hermes* 134 (2006), 290–300 (F 1, Hypothesis).

K. Kuiper, *Mnemosyne* 35 (1907), 354–85 (for Wilamowitz's response to Kuiper see general bibl. above); Page, *GLP* 120–3 (no. 15); H.-J. Mette, *ZPE* 50 (1983), 13–19; D. F. Sutton, *Two Lost Plays of Euripides* (Frankfurt, 1987), 5–106; Gantz 277, 291–5; K. J. Dover, *Aristophanes. Frogs* (Oxford, 1993), 54–5; *LIMC* VII.i.232–42 'Peirithoos' nos. 69–91, cf. V.i.182 'Herakles' nos. 3515–9 and VII.i.922–51 'Theseus' nos. 291–9.

On the authorship of *Pirithous* see the Introduction to this Appendix. For ascription to Euripides see also Kuiper, Page, Mette, Sutton, and for ascription to Critias, Dover. A further study is promised by Alvoni 290 n. 3 ('pseudo-Euripidean').

*The close friendship between Theseus and Pirithous, already implicit in their brief pairing at Homer,* Odyssey *11.631, is regularly attested in art and literature from the 6th century onwards (Gantz 277, 291–2,* LIMC *VII.i.232–3). The story of their joint descent into Hades to recover*

*Persephone (abducted by Hades) as Pirithous' future wife, and of their imprisonment and release, became increasingly varied from the mid-5th century into late antiquity (Gantz 293–5). This background to the play is summarized along with its plot in the narrative hypothesis preserved by the Byzantine Ioannes Logothetes. It ends by stating that both Theseus and Pirithous were rescued by Heracles, and it is probably the source of the scholia on the Byzantine Tzetzes,* Chiliades *4.911 (p. 573 Leone), which attribute the double rescue to Euripides and imply that a different version was commoner, in which Pirithous was intended as food for Cerberus and could not be rescued (so too Tzetzes on Aristophanes,* Frogs *142a; the double rescue reappears in e.g. Diodorus 4.26.12 and Hyginus,* Fab. *79.3; Heracles' rescue of Theseus alone during the same labour also occurs in Euripides'* Heracles *610–9, 1221–2, and the single rescue persists in e.g. Horace,* Odes *4.7.27–8: on this whole topic see Alvoni 294–5). The play's dominant theme of friendship under severe trial (here between all three main persons: F 1, Hypothesis, end; F 6, 7) is frequent in Euripides; it helps to suggest his authorship (Mette, Sutton), but cannot prove it.*

*Some of the fragments can be given a dramatic context. F 2–4 are from the entry chant of the Chorus, comprised apparently of dead initiates of the Eleusinian Mysteries (see note on F 2); they come to pour offerings to the underworld powers, but celebrate also physical and metaphysical aspects of the world above. F 1, Heracles' arrival in Hades and greeting by its 'gatekeeper' Aeacus, was for a time taken as the play's opening (so Snell in the first edition of* TrGF 1*); such a dialogue is not securely attested at the very beginning of a Euripidean prologue, and was therefore taken also to disqualify him from authorship, but it*

*is much more likely that the play began by presenting Theseus and the already fettered Pirithous, and that Heracles arrived perhaps immediately after the Chorus' entry chant.*[1] *F 4a and 5, Heracles' meeting and exchange with Pirithous, would follow; here it may be suggestive for the tone of the play that Pirithous appears to attribute the cause of his own punishment in Hades to his being the son of Ixion who was similarly arrogant towards the gods (F 5.12–20)—but the text breaks off here, and it is possible that Pirithous admitted comparable arrogance in himself in entering Hades. In probably a further episode Theseus would appeal to Heracles for rescue for both himself and Pirithous (F 7). The book fragment F 6 seems also to belong to this scene. The gnomic F 10 and 12 may well come from this part of the play too, but the gnomic F 11 cannot be located. That is all we have; the many representations in art of the three heroes in the underworld give no sure help in reconstructing the play (see* LIMC*).*

*Brief fragments: Critias F 13 (= Eur. fr. 599 N) 'pretext' and F 14 (= Eur. fr. 600 N) 'distress' (a verb). Other ascriptions: Eur. F 865, 868, 912 (also ascribed to* Cretans *or* Oedipus*), 936 (also to* Eurystheus*), 955c, 964 (of these all but F 912 mention or allude to Hades); Critias F 23;*[2] *and, most significantly, adesp. F 658 comprising two related papyrus fragments, P. Köln 2 with remains of twelve lines possibly describing the rescue of Theseus and Pirithous as*

[1] Wilamowitz himself had come to such an opinion: see *TrGF* 5.1107 and Gauly 110–1, who adds that a prologue which immediately presented Heracles is unlikely in a play named for Pirithous. But W. Luppe, *Philologus* 140 (1996), 217 holds to the older view.
[2] Suggested for *Pirithous*, in the vicinity of F 7, by Diels–Kranz; for the content see note 2 in the Introduction to this Appendix.

*a struggle facing Heracles greater than that with Cerberus,*[3] *and PSI inv. 3021 with damaged ends of twelve lines in which Persephone may be foretelling to Theseus or Pirithous the return to the living world of Theseus and also Pirithous;*[4] *Cockle (see under F 4a below) inclines to accept both fragments for the play (and for Euripides), but Snell–Kannicht in* TrGF 2.241 *decline attribution even to Critias on the ground of 'late' vocabulary.*

*It cannot be known whether the play was a tragedy or a satyr play. In favour of the first may be the similarity with* Prometheus Bound, *in which Prometheus is fettered apparently like Pirithous. A temptation to think the second may lie in the parodic scenes in Aristophanes,* Frogs *285–95 and especially 464–78, 605–73, where Dionysus-Heracles encounters Hades' gatekeeper (named as Aeacus in the mss., as in F 1 here: on this point see Dover [bibl. above]). It has been suggested that if* Pirithous *is Euripidean, it may have been 'prosatyric' like* Alcestis.

*Art in the modern period has concentrated on the more famous episode of Theseus and Pirithous at the Wedding of the Centaurs (*OGCMA *II.902–3).*

[3] Vv. 1–5 seem to be stichomythia: 1 ' . . . the curse of the Sown Men . . . '; 2 ' . . . you thought . . . the unyielding dog'; 3 ' . . . struggle . . . , not a wrestle with a beast'; 4 ' . . . to go . . . a most glorious struggle'; 5 ' . . . I shall destroy . . . ', then 6 ' . . . a bold heart . . . ', 9 ' . . . ruler (?) . . . ', 10 ' . . . expecting . . . '

[4] 'a place . . . you *(sing.)* together with Heracles . . . daughters [i.e. the Erinyes?] . . . hero [i.e. Heracles?] . . . is not fated . . . darkness. He will go even beneath the earth . . . as helper (*or* conductor) . . . (from?) the bounds which permit no return. A gorgon-face(?) with . . . eyes (will manifest itself?) to you *(sing.)*, fearsome with menace, of an undead thing . . . it will overcome my husband [i.e. Pirithous] . . . darkness . . . *(one line)* . . . (in?) the hidden depth . . . '

# ΠΕΙΡΙΘΟΥΣ

1, Hypothesis (~ Euripides pp. 546–7 Nauck)

*Πειρίθους ἐπὶ τὴν Περσεφόνης μνηστείαν μετὰ Θησέως εἰς Ἅιδου καταβὰς τιμωρίας ἔτυχε τῆς πρεπούσης· αὐτὸς μὲν γὰρ ἐπὶ πέτρας ἀκινήτῳ καθέδρᾳ πεδηθεὶς δρακόντων ἐφρουρεῖτο χάσμασιν, Θησεὺς δὲ τὸν φίλον ἐγκαταλιπεῖν αἰσχρὸν ἡγούμενος βίον εἶχε τὴν ἐν Ἅιδου ζωήν. ἐπὶ δὲ τὸν Κέρβερον Ἡρακλῆς ἀποσταλεὶς ὑπὸ Εὐρυσθέως τοῦ μὲν θηρίου βίᾳ περιεγένετο, τοὺς δὲ περὶ Θησέα χάριτι τῶν χθονίων θεῶν τῆς παρούσης ἀνάγκης ἐξέλυσεν, μιᾷ πράξει καὶ τὸν ἀνθιστάμενον χειρωσάμενος καὶ παρὰ θεῶν χάριν λαβὼν καὶ δυστυχοῦντας ἐλεήσας φίλους.*

*(For the rest of F 1 see after F 4 below)*

Ioannes Logothetes, Commentary on [Hermogenes], *Means of Rhetorical Effectiveness* 28 (ed. H. Rabe, *RhM* 63 [1908], 144–5); Gregory of Corinth, Commentary on the same treatise, *Rhet. Gr.* VII.1312–13 Walz; cf. Diggle, *TrGFS* 172; W. Luppe, *Philologus* 140 (1996), 216–9 (textual history and status of this hypothesis); G. Alvoni, *Hermes* 134 (2006), 290–300 (edition from a new

# PIRITHOUS

## 1, Hypothesis

To woo Persephone, Pirithous went down with Theseus into Hades and met with fitting punishment: he himself was fettered to an immovable seat upon rock and guarded by gaping serpents,[1] but Theseus held it shameful to abandon his friend there and went on with the existence in Hades as his life.[2] When Heracles was sent by Eurystheus to fetch Cerberus he overcame the beast by force,[3] and through the favour of the underworld gods released Theseus and his companion from their predicament: in one act he worsted his opponent, received favour from the gods, and took pity on friends in misfortune.

*(For the rest of F 1 see after F 4 below)*

[1] The vocabulary in 'fettered . . . serpents' is almost certainly borrowed from the play; but 'immovable seat' may allude to the posture forced upon those facing execution at Athens, for in some accounts Pirithous is set to be eaten by Cerberus (like Andromeda by a sea-monster). [2] The expression has been questioned (but cf. F 7.5–10, and F 12 for the idea) and altered: 'willingly chose the life in Hades' Nauck, 'willingly went on with the life in Hades' Wilamowitz. [3] Cf. Euripides' satyric *Eurystheus*.

recension of the mss.). Attributed by these sources to Euripides' *Pirithous*.

*βίον εἶχε* all mss. (so Alvoni: *βίου εἶχε* earlier read wrongly in the most important one): *ἑκὼν εἵλετο* Nauck: *ἑκὼν εἶχε* Wilamowitz

## 2 (= Eur. fr. 592 N)

ΧΟΡΟΣ

. . . *ἵνα πλημοχόας τάσδ' εἰς χθόνιον*
*χάσμ' εὐφήμως προχέωμεν.*

Athenaeus 11.496a, attributed to 'the author of the *Pirithous*, whether he is Critias the tyrant or Euripides'

## 3 (= Eur. fr. 594 N)

ΧΟΡΟΣ

*ἀκάμας τε χρόνος περί τ' ἀενάῳ*
*ῥεύματι πλήρης φοιτᾷ τίκτων*
*αὐτὸς ἑαυτόν, δίδυμοί τ' ἄρκτοι*
*ταῖς ὠκυπλάνοις πτερύγων ῥιπαῖς*
*τὸν Ἀτλάντειον τηροῦσι πόλον.*

Clement of Alexandria, *Miscellanies* 5.6.36.1, attributed to 'tragedy'; v. 5: Schol. on Aristophanes, *Birds* 179, attributed to Euripides' *Pirithous* and slightly adapted

## 2 (= Eur. fr. 592 N)

CHORUS

. . . so that we may pour these ewers in reverent silence into earth's chasm.[1]

[1] From the entry song of the Chorus, continued in F 3–4. Athenaeus names the ewers as those used on the final day of the Eleusinian Mysteries, and it is inferred that the Chorus therefore comprised dead initiates; *Cretans* F 472 has a similar entry by a ritual Chorus. Diodorus 4.25.1 and Apollodorus 2.5.12 tell that Heracles thought it wise to be initiated in the Mysteries before descending into Hades. Cf. *Heracles* 613.

## 3 (= Eur. fr. 594 N)

CHORUS

Time is unwearying; full in its ever-flowing stream it goes its round begetting itself;[1] and the twin bears[2] with the swift traverse of their beating wings keep watch on Atlas' vault of sky.

[1] In the Greek *heauton* 'itself' imitates *eniauton* 'year', thus Time regularly begets its own regular and measured length. For the etymology cf. especially Eur. F 862 and Hermippus F 73 *PCG*, with Egli 51–3 who traces the thought to Heraclitus. See also on the next fragment. [2] Ursa Major and Minor, in the northern sky.

## 4 (= Eur. fr. 593 N)

ΧΟΡΟΣ

*σὲ τὸν αὐτοφυῆ, τὸν ἐν αἰθερίῳ*
*ῥύμβῳ πάντων φύσιν ἐμπλέξανθ',*
*ὃν πέρι μὲν φῶς, πέρι δ' ὀρφναία*
*νὺξ αἰολόχρως ἄκριτός τ' ἄστρων*
*ὄχλος ἐνδελεχῶς ἀμφιχορεύει . . .*

Clement of Alexandria, *Miscellanies* 5.14.114.2, attributed to Euripides' *Pirithous*; vv. 1–4 (*τὸν ἐν αἰθερίῳ* etc.): Satyrus, *Life of Euripides* P. Oxy. 1176 fr. 37 col. II, implicitly attributed to Euripides; vv. 1–2: Schol. on *Orestes* 982, attributed to Euripides' *Pirithous*, and (disordered) Schol. on Apollonius Rhodius 4.143, cf. on 1.1134, both naming Euripides' *Pirithous*

## 1, cont'd (= Eur. fr. 591 N)

ΑΙΑΚΟΣ

*ἔα, τί χρῆμα; δέρκομαι σπουδῇ τινα*
*δεῦρ' ἐγκονοῦντα καὶ μάλ' εὐτόλμῳ φρενί.*
*εἰπεῖν δίκαιον, ὦ ξέν', ὅστις ὢν τόπους*
*ἐς τούσδε χρίμπτῃ καὶ καθ' ἥντιν' αἰτίαν.*

Ioannes (F 1, Hypothesis above) continues immediately with this fragment; Gregory has only vv. 6–10 before the Hypothesis; v. 9 is attributed by them to both Euripides' *Pirithous* and his *Melanippe Wise* (= F 481.1), and by Hermogenes (citing only v. 9) to Euripides. Re-edited by G. Alvoni, *Philologus* 152 (2008), 40–7.

## 4 (= Eur. fr. 593 N)

CHORUS

You, who generate your own self, who entwine the nature of all things in heaven's whirl, round which the light of day, round which night's spangled darkness and the countless host of stars dance perpetually . . .[1]

[1] According to Clement these verses addressed Mind, as creator of the universe (this theory of Mind was associated with the pre-Socratic Anaxagoras, whose influence on Euripides was asserted in Satyrus' *Life*: see apparatus opposite); but Time has also been suggested as the addressee, as in F 3, or Zeus himself. F 3 and 4 are a semi-scientific, semi-mystical evocation of the elemental world (and a ground for argument about the authorship of the play, as noted in the Introduction to this Appendix). Egli 49–53 notes the equation of Time with Olympus (i.e. Zeus) in the famous Derveni papyrus (P. Derv. col. XXX.3) and its representation as a creative force in Orphism (1 B 12 and 13 DK).

## 1, cont'd (= Eur. fr. 591 N)[1]

*An entry scene later in the play:*

AEACUS

What? What's this? I see someone toiling in haste towards me here, and with a very brave heart. Stranger, it is right you should say who you are, and for what reason you approach this place.

[1] Quoted with the Hypothesis above by its sources, but almost certainly following F 2–4 (see Introduction).

ΗΡΑΚΛΗΣ

*οὐδεὶς ὄκνος πάντ' ἐκκαλύψασθαι λόγον·*
*ἐμοὶ πατρὶς μὲν Ἄργος, ὄνομα δ' Ἡρακλῆς,*
*θεῶν δὲ πάντων πατρὸς ἐξέφυν Διός·*
*ἐμῇ γὰρ ἦλθε μητρὶ κεδνὰ πρὸς λέχη*
*Ζεύς, ὡς λέλεκται τῆς ἀληθείας ὕπο.*
*ἥκω δὲ δεῦρο πρὸς βίαν, Εὐρυσθέως*
*ἀρχαῖς ὑπείκων, ὅς μ' ἔπεμψ' Ἅιδου κύνα*
*ἄγειν κελεύων ζῶντα πρὸς Μυκηνίδας*
*πύλας, ἰδεῖν μὲν οὐ θέλων, ἆθλον δέ μοι*
*ἀνήνυτον τόνδ' ᾤετ' ἐξηυρηκέναι.*
*τοιόνδ' ἰχνεύων πρᾶγος Εὐρώπης κύκλῳ*
*Ἀσίας τε πάσης ἐς μυχοὺς ἐλήλυθα.*

8 *κεδνὰ πρὸς λέχη* Dobree: *κεδνῇ* (i.e. -*ῇ*) *πρὸς λέχος* Ioann. and (some mss.) Greg. 14 *τόνδ' ᾤετ' ἐξηυρηκέναι* Stahl, Wilamowitz: *τὸν ἔδωκ' ἐξηνυκέναι* Ioann.

4a

⟨ΠΕΙΡΙΘΟΥΣ?⟩

*δρακοντ*[
*τηνου*[
*ὀργὴν* .[
*ἐπίσταμ*[*αι*

ΧΟΡΟΣ

*ὀψὲ ξυνεὶς* [. . . .]*ο* . . [
*θεοὺς σέβεσθ*[*αι*

HERACLES

I do not shrink from revealing my whole story. My country is Argos, and my name Heracles, and I am the son of Zeus, father of all gods: for Zeus, as is truly told, came to a splendid union with my mother. I have come here under compulsion, yielding to the commands of Eurystheus, who sent me with orders to bring the Hound of Hades alive to Mycenae's gates—not because he wished to see it, but he thought he had invented in this a task beyond my accomplishment. In pursuit of this business I have circled the inmost parts of all Europe and Asia.[2]

[2] Presumably searching for an entrance to Hades.

## 4a

‹PIRITHOUS?›

. . . serpent(s)[1] . . . anger . . . (I) know . . .

CHORUS

Your understanding is late . . . to respect the gods . . .

P. Oxy. 3531, ed. H. M. Cockle and others (1983), a separated part of P. Oxy. 2078 (F 5 and 7 below); re-ed. R. Kannicht, *TrGF* $1^2$ (1986), 349–51, cf. B. Gauly in *Musa Tragica* 114; Diggle, *TrGFS* 174–5. Names (or changes) of speakers were entered by a second hand.

6 σέβεσθ[αι an attractive supplement, but the papyrus is insecurely read

ΗΡΑΚΛΗΣ

*Ἰξίονος πα[ῖ, πο]λλὰ δ[*
*εἶδον λόγῳ τ' ἤκουσα [*
*οὐδ' ἐγγὺς οὐδέν' ἠ[σθόμην*
*τῇ σῇ πελάζοντ' ἀλ[λ-*
*δυσπραξίᾳ τοὺς π[*
*σκῆψιν τίν' ἢ τίν' [*
*ἄτης ἀπρούπτως' .[*

ΠΕΙΡΙΘΟΥΣ

*ἤδ' οὐκέτ' ἐστ' ἄσημος [οὐδ(ὲ)*
*ὀνειρατώδης ἀλλ' ο[*
*Ἕλλην· ἰδεῖν δὲ τὸν λέ[γοντα*
*οἷός τ' ἂν εἴην. πέπτατ[αι*
*ἀχλὺς πάροιθε τῶν ἐμῶ[ν*
*ἄθλους ἐρωτᾷς τοὺς ἐμο[ὺς*
*γλώσσης γὰρ ἠχὼ τῆσδε πρ..[*

ΗΡΑΚΛΗΣ

*οὐδέν τι πάντως θαῦμ[α*
*ἀπεστερῆσθαί <σ'> ἐστὶν α..[*
*καὶ φθέγμα καὶ σχῆμα .[*
*πολλαὶ διῆλθον τῆς ἐ[μῆς*
*καὶ σῆς· ἀναμνήσω δε.[*

9 *ἠ[σθόμην τύχῃ ποτὲ* Parsons 10 *ἀλ[λ' ὑπερβάλλεις μακρῷ* West 12 *τίν' ἢ τὶν' [* Cockle 15 *ὅ[σον γ' ἐπεικάσαι* Diggle: *ὁ [φωνήσας τάδε* Maehler 16 *λέ[γοντα* Handley 23 end *ἡμέραι* Parsons 24 *ἐ[μῆς ὁμιλίας* Cockle: *ἐ[μῆς ἀπαλλαγῆς* Collard

HERACLES

Son of Ixion, many . . . have I seen and heard told . . . (but? I have learned) of no one (ever) closely approaching your (misfortune); but in harshness of outcome (you far surpass) those . . . what excuse or what . . . (for?) ruin unforeseeably . . .

PIRITHOUS

This (voice) is no longer unintelligible (nor) . . . dream-like, but . . . (is?) Greek.[2] I would be able to see the (speaker) . . . (but?) a mist has spread before my (eyes?) . . . You ask about my ordeal . . . : for an echo of those words . . .[3]

HERACLES

It is absolutely no wonder . . . that (you) are deprived . . . (my?) voice and appearance . . . Many (days?) . . . of (my and) your . . .[4] have lapsed. I will remind (you) . . .

[1] Guarding Pirithous (see Hypothesis). [2] Presumably Heracles' voice (cf. v. 23); but Cockle suggests Pirithous may imagine the voice of an approaching Fury (cf. v. 26) or 'gorgon-face' (cf. adesp. F 658 in the Introduction, 'Other ascriptions', note 4), like the 'monster' heard and feared in the apparent parody of *Pirithous* at Aristophanes, *Frogs* 285–95 (see Introduction, at end). [3] Pirithous has heard Heracles' question in v. 19 only with difficulty. [4] Cockle suggests '(my and) your (acquaintance)', for this line is (so far) the only indication from myth that Heracles and Pirithous had met before; Kannicht suggested that 'separation' might suit better, whence Collard's conjecture.

ΠΕΙΡΙΘΟΥΣ

σίγησον· ἆρ[(α)
φων[
της[

26 σίγησον· ἆρ[(α) Mette: σειγησιναρ[ P. Oxy.

## 5

‹ΠΕΙΡΙΘΟΥΣ›

*beginnings of six lines including* 1 ἐσφηλα[ 4 ἐλθὼν .[
5 Ἑλλην[ 6 βωμω..[ , *then:*

θεὸς δὲ μανια[
ἔπεμψεν ἄτη[ν
νεφέλην γυναικ[
ἔσπειρεν εἰς τοὺς Θε[σσάλους
θυγατρὶ μίσγοιτ' ε[
τοίων δὲ κόμπω[ν
ποινὰς θεοῖς ἔτεισεν [
μανίας τροχῷ περι[
οἰστρη[λ]άτοισιν ᾤχ[ετ(ο)
ἄπυστο[ς] ἀνθρώποι[σιν οὐδέ νιν τάφος
ἔκρυψεν, ἀλλὰ Βορε[άσιν πνοαῖς
διεσπα[ρ]άχθη σῶμ[α

P. Oxy. 2078, ed. A. S. Hunt (1927), fr. 1 (frs. 2 and 3 are F 7 below; frs. 4 and 5, in which hardly a word can be read, are F 8 and 9, omitted here); re-ed. A. Körte, *APF* 10 (1932), 50–3; Page, *GLP* 120–5 (no. 15); Gauly in *Musa Tragica* 116–17; Diggle, *TrGFS* 175–6.

PIRITHOUS

Quiet! . . . voice . . . ?[5]

[5] Mette's supplement suggests a possible continuation: 'Quiet! (Do you hear) a voice . . . ?', as if of some approaching terror.

## 5

<PIRITHOUS>

*beginnings of six lines including* 1 (they?) brought low *or* ruined  3 coming  5 (a?) Greek  6 altars, *then*: The god however . . . (with?) madness . . . sent ruin . . . a cloud as wife . . . sowed (a report) among the (Thessalians) (that?) he had lain with the daughter . . . For such boasts . . . he paid the gods penalty . . . (for his?) madness on a wheel . . . (he was gone?) . . . (in?) frenzied . . . vanished from men's knowledge (and no tomb) hid him, but his body was torn apart (by?) northern (blasts). . . . my father (was de-

15 ὤ̣χ[ετο (χ insecure): ὤχ[μασεν Housman  16 end Körte  17 end Housman  18 σῶμ[α read by Cockle: σ[υ]ν μ[ Hunt

πατὴ[ρ ἁ]μαρτὼν εἰς θε[οὺς ἀπώλετο
ἐγὼ [δ' ἐκ]είνου π[ή]ματα [

19 end Körte: 18–19 τήνδε δὴ τίσιν | . . . εἰς θε[οὺς ἐκτήσατο Diggle

6 (= Eur. fr. 595 N)

αἰδοῦς ἀχαλκεύτοισιν ἔζευκται πέδαις.

Plutarch, *Moralia* 96c (mentioning Theseus and Pirithous in a treatise on friendship) and 482a and 533a, all without attribution; and at 763f with attribution to Euripides

7

*ends of three dialogue trimeters, including* 3 πόνου, *then:*
*c. 9 letters* ]̣σοι το ̣[. . . . .] ἡδὺ ν[ῦ]ν δοκεῖ

<ΘΗΣΕΥΣ?>

οὐκ ]τος, Ἡράκλεις, [σὲ] μέμφομαι
*c. 9 letters* ]η, πιστὸν γὰρ ἄνδρα καὶ φίλον

P. Oxy. 2078 (see under F 5) frs. 2 (vv. 1–32) and 3 (vv. 33–39)

5 οὐκ supplied by Körte

stroyed) for his offence to the gods. I . . . his sufferings . . .[1]

[1] Pirithous recounts the cruel price his father Ixion (a Thessalian) paid the gods for his (mad?) boasting that he had seduced Cronus' daughter Hera, the wife of Zeus; but it appears from 'cloud as wife' that Zeus deceived him with a phantom (as in Pindar, *Pythians* 2.21–42; for Ixion's arrogance and Zeus's deception cf. Eur. *Ixion* test. ii–iii and F 426–7). While myth generally tells of Ixion's endless torture on the wheel, some accounts (and some art) have him associated with winds or, as apparently in vv. 17–18, torn apart by them. Editors' supplements in this fragment depend largely on their differing accommodation of such variant detail. In v. 15 Housman's 'he rode (i.e. rode the wheel)' makes a grim metaphor from mastering a horse. In vv. 18–19 Diggle suggests '(This was indeed the punishment) my father (got) for his offence . . .'

6 (= Eur. fr. 595 N)

He (i.e. Theseus) is joined (to me?) in the unforged fetters of a sense of honour.[1]

[1] Possibly Pirithous explaining Theseus' selflessness to Heracles (cf. F 7.6–7). Cf. the two friends' 'invisible bond' in Apollonius Rhodius 1.102.

7

*ends of three dialogue lines, including* 3 labour, *then:*
. . . now seems pleasant to you.

<THESEUS?>

. . . , Heracles, I will (not) blame (you) . . . . . . for (it is

*αἰσχρὸν πρ]οδοῦναι δυσμ[εν]ῶς εἰλημμένον.*

⟨ΗΡΑΚΛΗΣ⟩

*σαυτῷ τε,] Θησεῦ, τῇ τ' Ἀθηναίων πό[λει*
*πρέποντ' ἔλεξας· τοῖσι δυσ[τυ]χοῦσι γὰρ*
*ἀεί ποτ' εἶ σὺ σύμμαχος· σκῆψιν [δ' ἐμ]οὶ*
*ἀεικές ἐστ' ἔχοντα πρὸς πάτραν μολεῖν.*
*Εὐρυσθέα γὰρ πῶς δοκεῖς ἂν ἄσμενον,*
*εἴ μοι πύθοιτο ταῦτα συμπράξαντά σε,*
*λέγειν ἂν ὡς ἄκραντος ἤθληται πόνος;*

⟨ΘΗΣΕΥΣ⟩

*ἀλλ' οὗ σὺ χρῄζεις π[* c. 9 *letters* ] *ἐμὴν ἔχεις*
*εὔνοιαν, οὐκ ἔμπλ[ηκτον, ἀλλ' ἐλ]ευθέρως*
*ἐχθροῖσί τ' ἐχθρὰν [καὶ φίλοισι]ν εὐμενῆ.*
*πρόσθεν σ' ἐμοὶ τ[* c. 12 *letters* ]*ει λόγος,*
*λέγοις δ' ἂν [. . . .]. [* c. 12 *letters* ]*ους λόγους.*

⟨ΗΡΑΚΛΗΣ⟩

*ὦ φ[ίλτατ(ε)*

vv. 21–39: *further trimeters from a continuing dialogue (perhaps joined by Pirithous), with a few words read at or towards their ends*:

*ὑ]πηρετῶ*
*]. θν[η]τῶ[ν] φρένας*
*] γνώμης ἄτερ*
*τοῦ]τό σοι φίλον*

7 beg. Hunt 14 λέγειν Housman: λέξειν P. Oxy. 20 so Kannicht

shameful) to betray a true and faithful friend when he has been seized malevolently.

<HERACLES>

Theseus, your words become (both yourself) and the city of the Athenians; for you have ever been an ally of those in misfortune. It is unseemly however that I should return to my fatherland with an excuse;[1] for how gladly Eurystheus would say—do you not think?—if he learned that you had shared this labour with me, that I had struggled with the task but left it unfulfilled!

<THESEUS>

But what you desire . . . you have my goodwill, not from impulse (but) freely, in enmity to enemies and good intention (towards friends). The word (is?) that in the past you . . . to me, and now, if you please, say . . . (the same?) words.

<HERACLES?>

O (my good friend?) . . .

*Heracles and Theseus seem to have continued their dialogue, and Pirithous may have joined in; only a few further words can be read securely (speakers indeterminable):*
22 I serve 23 the minds of mortal men 24 without

[1] Theseus appears to have offered Heracles help in overcoming Cerberus, but Heracles fears that Eurystheus would discount a labour which he had not completed alone, and impose another (as he did with the Hydra and Augeas' stables: Apollodorus 2.5.2, 2.5.5). Theseus may have offered help in the hope of its being returned with the release of Pirithous and himself (see Hypothesis). In v. 7 Hunt's '(it is shameful)' matches the Hypothesis well ('Theseus held it shameful . . . ').

]δικώτατ᾽ αἰτιᾷ θεούς
]η πᾶς [ἀ]νέρριπται κύβος
]..οντα μὴ μάταιον ᾖ
]ην ἔχὼ .εξα[.] δὲ χρή
]μαθεῖν ὅτου[

*mutilated ends of ten further lines, including* 34 ]αλλαγην, 37 ]ι θεῷ, 38 ] νερτέρων

26 ἐκ]δικώτατ᾽ or ἐν]δικώτατ᾽ Körte

10 (= Eur. fr. 598 N)

οὐκ ἀγυμνάστῳ φρενὶ
ἔρριψεν, ὅστις τόνδ᾽ ἐκαίνισεν λόγον,
ὡς τοῖσιν εὖ φρονοῦσι συμμαχεῖ τύχη.

Stobaeus 2.8.4, attributed to Euripides' *Pirithous*; v. 3: [Menander], *Monostichs* 637 Jaekel, cf. Menander F 500.1 *PCG*

1 beg. ὁ πρῶτος εἰπὼν Stob., deleted by Wilamowitz

11 (= Eur. fr. 597 N)

τρόπος δὲ χρηστὸς ἀσφαλέστερος νόμου·
τὸν μὲν γὰρ οὐδεὶς ἂν διαστρέψαι ποτὲ
ῥήτωρ δύναιτο, τὸν δ᾽ ἄνω τε καὶ κάτω
λόγοις ταράσσων πολλάκις λυμαίνεται.

Stobaeus 3.37.15, attributed to *Pirithous*

12 (= Eur. fr. 596 N)

οὔκουν τὸ μὴ ζῆν κρεῖσσόν ἐστ᾽ ἢ ζῆν κακῶς;

Stobaeus 4.53.23, attributed to Euripides' *Pirithous*

resolve 25 (this) is dear to you 26 he accuses the gods most (un?)justly 27 the die is wholly cast 28 that it may not be in vain 29 I have . . . and/but . . . ought . . . 30 to learn whose(?) . . . 34 change *or* release 37 to/for the god 38 of the dead

## 10 (= Eur. fr. 598 N)

There was no unpractised mind in the man who coined and threw out this saying, that fortune is an ally to those of good sense.

## 11 (= Eur. fr. 597 N)

A good character is surer than a law: no orator would ever be able to distort it, whereas often one of them defiles the law with words which cause confusion high and low.

## 12 (= Eur. fr. 596 N)

So isn't not living superior to living in dishonour?[1]

[1] Perhaps part of Theseus' argument for refusing to abandon Pirithous (see note on F 7).

# RHADAMANTHYS

*TrGF 1* 43 Critias F 15–18; B. Gauly in *Musa Tragica* 120–1 (F 17 only).

Gantz 259–60; J. Davidson, *AC* 68 (1999), 247–52; *LIMC* VII.i.626–8 'Rhadamanthys'.

On the authorship of *Rhadamanthys* see the Introduction to this Appendix.

*Rhadamanthys (a pre-Hellenic name) is best known as one of the sons born by Europa to Zeus after he had carried her to Crete, and as a wise lawgiver who after his death resided happily in the Elysian Fields (Homer,* Odyssey *4. 563–5) or the Islands of the Blessed (Pindar,* Olympians *2.75), or became one of the judges in the Underworld (first in Plato,* Gorgias *523e). There was also a tradition, possibly as early as the 5th century, that he married Heracles' mother Alcmene after her first husband Amphitryon's death, either in the Isles of the Blessed or in Boeotia where he had come to live in exile (on all this see* LIMC *and Gantz, and on the marriage with Alcmene, Davidson). The story implied in the hypothesis fragment describing the play's ending (F 15 below) shows no connection with any of these traditions. It involves the deaths of Zeus's twin sons Castor and Pollux, of whom one or both are usually said to have been killed by the sons of Aphareus in a dispute over*

*the daughters of Leucippus; as a result, they attained a shared immortality (see Gantz 323–8). How Rhadamanthys and his daughters could be associated with the deaths of Castor, and why the daughters should have been deified, is entirely unclear.*

# ΡΑΔΑΜΑΝΘΥΣ

## 15 (Hypothesis)

[Πολυδεύκους, ἀνῃρέθη μονομαχήσας. Ῥ]αδαμάνθυος δ' ἐπὶ μὲν τῇ νίκῃ [χ]αίρ]οντος, ἐπὶ δὲ ταῖς θυγατράσιν ἀ[λγ]οῦντος Ἄρτεμις ἐπιφανεῖσα πρ[οσέταξε τὴν μὲν Ἑλένην ἀ[μφοτέροις τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς τοῖς τεθν[ηκόσι τὰς τιμὰς καταστήσασθαι, [τὰς θυγατέρας δ' αὐτοῦ θεὰς ἔφησε γ[ενέσθαι.

---

PSI XII.1286 col. ii.1–8, ed. V. Bartoletti (1951: previously C. Gallavotti, *RFIC* 11 (1933), 177–88); re-ed. Austin, *NFE* 92, van Rossum-Steenbeek 202. The same papyrus has parts of the hypotheses to the extant *Rhesus* and to *Scyrians*.

## 16 (= Eur. fr. 658 N)

οἳ γῆν ἔχουσ' Εὐβοΐδα πρόσχωρον πόλιν

# RHADAMANTHYS

## 15 (Hypothesis)

. . . (after?) Polydeuces (died)[1] . . . he (Castor) was killed fighting alone. Rhadamanthys rejoiced at the victory but grieved for his daughters; but Artemis appeared and instructed Helen to establish the rites honouring (both) her dead brothers, and declared that his daughters (had become) goddesses.[2] (*end of hypothesis*)

[1] Sense supplied by Snell. [2] For a similar outcome compare *Erechtheus* F 370.55ff.

## 16 (= Eur. fr. 658 N)

. . . who possess the neighbouring state, the land of Euboea . . .[1]

[1] The traditional possessors of Euboea were the Abantes (Homer, *Iliad* 2.536); 'neighbouring' presumably means next to Boeotia, which was sometimes associated with Rhadamanthys (see Introduction above).

Strabo 8.3.31, with attribution to Euripides' *Rhadamanthys*

## 17 (= Eur. fr. 659 N)

<ΡΑΔΑΜΑΝΘΥΣ?>

*ἔρωτες ἡμῖν εἰσὶ παντοῖοι βίου·*
*ὁ μὲν γὰρ εὐγένειαν ἱμείρει λαβεῖν,*
*τῷ δ' οὐχὶ τούτου φροντίς, ἀλλὰ χρημάτων*
*πολλῶν κεκλῆσθαι βούλεται πατὴρ δόμοις·*
*ἄλλῳ δ' ἀρέσκει μηδὲν ὑγιὲς ἐκ φρενῶν*
*λέγοντι πείθειν τοὺς πέλας τόλμῃ κακῇ·*
*οἱ δ' αἰσχρὰ κέρδη πρόσθε τοῦ καλοῦ βροτῶν*
*ζητοῦσιν· οὕτω βίοτος ἀνθρώπων πλάνη.*
*ἐγὼ δὲ τούτων οὐδενὸς χρῄζω τυχεῖν,*
*δόξαν <δὲ> βουλοίμην ἂν εὐκλείας ἔχειν.*

Stobaeus 2.8.12, with attribution to Euripides; vv. 1–8: Stobaeus 4.20b.61, with attribution to Euripides' *Rhadamanthys*; v. 4: Schol. on *Orestes* 1197, with attribution to Euripides

## 18 (= Eur. fr. 660 N)

*οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἡμᾶς <ὅστις> ἐξαιρήσεται.*

*Anecdota Graeca* I.94.1 Bekker, with attribution to Euripides' *Rhadamanthys*

<*ὅστις*> Van Dam

## 17 (= Eur. fr. 659 N)

<RHADAMANTHYS?>

The desires we have for our lives are of all kinds. One man yearns to get nobility, while another cares nothing for this but wishes to be called the father of great riches[1] in his house. Another is pleased to say nothing honest based on careful thought, and to influence those around him with evil bravado; and others again among men seek shameful profits rather than virtue. Such are the ways in which human life can err; but I want to get none of these things myself, and would rather have the renown of a good reputation.[2]

[1] I.e. the creator of ancestral wealth for his heirs (Snell).
[2] For the fragment's 'priamel' form cf. *Danae* F 316 with note. These may have been the play's opening lines, as F 285 may have opened *Bellerophon*.

## 18 (= Eur. fr. 660 N)

(There is) none (who) shall dispossess us.[1]

[1] Perhaps one of the Disocuri, or of Aphareus' sons, laying claim to the disputed girls?

# TENNES

*TrGF* 1 43 Critias F 20–21, with F 20a in *TrGF* 5.1108–9.

Jouan (1966), 303–8; Gantz 591–2; *LIMC* VII.i.893 'Tennes'; M. Huys, *ZPE* 152 (2005), 203–8; M. Polito in A. Mele et al., *Eoli ed Eolide: tra madrepatria e colonie* (Naples, 2005), 187–99.

On the authorship of *Tennes* see the Introduction to this Appendix.

*Ten(n)es, eponym of the island of Tenedos off the coast of the Troad, was probably a pre-Greek god in origin. Greek myth made him a migrant from the mainland and founder of the polis of Tenedos. His story is told fairly consistently in numerous mythographic sources.*[1] *It may have been told at least in part in the epic* Cypria, *although it is not mentioned in Proclus' summary of that poem. Tennes and Hemithea (in some accounts Leucothea) were the children of Cycnus, a ruler in the area of Troy; their mother died, and Cycnus' second wife tried to seduce Tennes; when he rejected her advances, she accused him of assaulting her*

[1] Chiefly Conon *FGrH* 26 F 1.xxviii, Apollodorus, Epit. 3.24; for a thorough list and a recently published ostracon text from Egypt see Huys 203 and Polito 191, 193, 197–8; on the ostracon also W. Luppe, *APF* 51 (2005), 65–6.

*and with support from an aulos-player persuaded Cycnus to set both Tennes and his sister adrift in a chest which floated to the nearby island of Leucophrys (F 20a.5).*[2] *Cycnus learned that he had been deceived and attempted a reconcilation, but Tennes prevented him from landing on the island. Tennes' merits caused him to be made the island's ruler, and it was renamed Tenedos in his honour. He was eventually killed by Achilles when the Achaeans landed there on their way to Troy.*

*The hypothesis (F 20) shows that the play told the story of the false accusation and Cycnus' discovery of the truth, differing from most accounts insofar as the island is renamed by Cycnus at Apollo's command rather than by Tennes himself or his people. Apollo no doubt intervened with this command at the play's conclusion, and probably excused Cycnus in view of his wife's treachery; Tennes' rejection of a reconcilation may have been overlooked.*

*Aeschylus may have composed a* Tennes *concerning the Achaean landing on Tenedos and the death of Tennes: see Radt in* TrGF 3, *pp. 343 (with refs.) and 479–80 (F 451o = P. Oxy. 2256. frs. 51–3), and Polito (2005), 197 n. 68.*

*The story of Tennes is not certainly depicted in art: see* LIMC 'Tennes'.

[2] Compare the stories of Danae and Perseus (*Danae*, *Dictys*) and one version of the story of Auge and Telephus (*Auge*, Introduction). Other elements of this story are familiar in Euripides, especially that of 'Potiphar's Wife' in *Hippolytus Veiled*, *Stheneboea* etc.

# ΤΕΝΝΗΣ

## 20 (Hypothesis)

*one very fragmentary line*

. . . .]κλείσας [
[μ]άρτυρα των[
σάμενος· τα[
μετεμέλη[ ]. . .ι τ[ὸ]ν Τ[έ]ν-
νην ἤκουσεν ἐπὶ τὴ[ν] ἀντιπέρα νῆσον
σεσῶσθαι· προειπό[ν]τος δ᾽ Ἀπόλλωνος
τὴν μὲν νῆσον Τένεδον προσηγόρευσεν,
τ]ὴν δὲ ψευσα[μέν]ην γυναῖκα ἀπέκτεινεν.

---

P. Oxy. 2455 fr. 14, ed. E. Turner (1962); re-ed. Austin, *NFE* 97, W. Luppe, *APF* 35 (1989), 7–10 with 39 (1993), 15–16

2 κλείσας [εἰς λάρνακα Turner 3–4 [μ]άρτυρα τῶν [διαβολῶν αὐλητὴν ποιη]σάμενος Turner
5 μετεμέλη[σε (*sc.* Κύκνῳ) Turner: μετεμελή[θη Luppe

# TENNES

## 20 (Hypothesis)

. . . shutting . . . witness of the . . . [1] (he) relented . . . he heard that Tennes had safely reached the island opposite. At Apollo's command he named the island Tenedos and killed the wife who had deceived him. *(end of hypothesis)*

[1] Turner suggested 'shutting (them in a chest)' and '(mak)ing (an aulos-player) a witness of the (slanders)'.

## 20a (Myth summary)

*τῇ ἀδελφῇ .(.)[*
*τα θάλατταν [ ἡ δ̣ὲ*
*λάρναξ κατάγ[εται θείᾳ*
*γνώμῃ τῇ τό[τε μὲν ἐπικα-*
*λουμένῃ νήσ[ῳ Λευκόφρυϊ,*
*Τενέδῳ δὲ ὕστ[ερον ἀπ' αὐτοῦ*
*προσαγορευθε[ίσῃ. οὕτως*
*Μύρτιλος καὶ Ε[ὐριπίδης?*

P. Hamburg 199, ed. B. Kramer and D. Hagedorn (1984), col. ii, from a mythographic commentary on Homer, *Iliad* 1.38–9; re-ed. R. Kannicht, *TrGF* 5.1108; cf. W. Luppe, *ZPE* 56 (1984), 31–2

7 οὕτως Luppe: ἱστοροῦσιν (too long) ed. pr. 8 ε[ or θ[ P. Hamb.: Ε[ὐριπίδης or Θ[εόπομπος Kannicht

## 21 (= Eur. fr. 695 N)

*φεῦ·*
*οὐδὲν δίκαιόν ἐστιν ἐν τῷ νῦν γένει.*

Stobaeus 3.2.15, with attribution to Euripides' *Tennes*

## 20a (Myth summary)

. . . (with?) his sister . . . the sea . . . The chest was (brought) ashore by (divine) intention on the island then named (Leucophrys) but later Tenedos (for Tennes): thus Myrsilus[1] and E(uripides?).[2]

[1] A historian from Lesbos (*FGrH* no. 477). [2] Kannicht suggests either E(uripides) or Th(eopompus) (i.e. the historian Theopompus of Chios), and thinks it more likely that the mythographer would add a poet rather than another historian.

## 21 (= Eur. fr. 695 N)

Alas, the present generation is wholly without justice.

# SISYPHUS(?)

*TrGF 1* 43 Critias F 19; B. Gauly in *Musa Tragica* 120–3; Battegazzore (1962: see general bibl. above), 304–15; M. Davies *BICS* 36 (1989), 16–32; Diggle, *TrGFS* 177–9, cf. *Prometheus* 22 (1996), 103–4; Pechstein 185–92, 289–318, 319–44, and in Krumeich 552–61; P. Cipolla, *Poeti minori del dramma satiresco* (Amsterdam, 2003), 225–69.

A. Dihle, *Hermes* 105 (1977), 28–42; D. F. Sutton, *CQ* 31 (1981), 33–8; R. Scodel, *The Trojan Trilogy of Euripides* (Göttingen, 1982), 124–8; M. Winiarczyk, *Wiener Studien* 100 (1987), 35–45; D. Obbink, *Philodemus on Piety. Part I* (Oxford, 1996), 353–5; Voelke 358–62.

On the authorship of this fragment see the Introduction to this Appendix. See also Battegazzore, Sutton, Winiarczyk, Obbink for ascription to Critias, and Dihle, Scodel, Pechstein for ascription to Euripides.

*Neither the presumed title of this play nor its single fragment—if it is indeed by Critias and not from Euripides'* Sisyphus*—permits any inference about its plot, nor is it certain that the play was satyric; on all these issues see the Introduction to this Appendix. Textual uncertainties in the fragment itself permit quite differing translations at some places (vv. 11–13, 16, 18–19, 25–6, 28, 33, 37–9), and these*

*in turn permit and affect (or reflect) differing views of its authorship. We have translated it as objectively as we can.*

*Other ascription: Euripides F 1007c (see there).*

# ΣΙΣΥΦΟΣ(?)

## 19 (= Critias fr. 1 N)

ΣΙΣΥΦΟΣ

*ἦν χρόνος ὅτ᾽ ἦν ἄτακτος ἀνθρώπων βίος*
*καὶ θηριώδης ἰσχύος θ᾽ ὑπηρέτης,*
*ὅτ᾽ οὐδὲν ἆθλον οὔτε τοῖς ἐσθλοῖσιν ἦν*
*οὔτ᾽ αὖ κόλασμα τοῖς κακοῖς ἐγίγνετο.*
*κἄπειτά μοι δοκοῦσιν ἄνθρωποι νόμους*
*θέσθαι κολαστάς, ἵνα δίκη τύραννος ᾖ*
< > *τήν θ᾽ ὕβριν δούλην ἔχῃ·*
*ἐζημιοῦτο δ᾽ εἴ τις ἐξαμαρτάνοι.*
*ἔπειτ᾽ ἐπειδὴ τἀμφανῆ μὲν οἱ νόμοι*
*ἀπεῖργον αὐτοὺς ἔργα μὴ πράσσειν βίᾳ,*

Sextus Empiricus, *Against the Experts* 9.54, attributed to Critias (no play is named); vv. 1–2, 17–18 (and 9–16 in paraphrase): Aetius, *Opinions* 1.7.2, attributed to Sisyphus in Euripides; vv. 33–4: Chrysippus fr. phys. 1009 von Arnim, attributed to Euripides; v. 34: Philo, *On Dreams* 1, unattributed; v. 35: see below

7 <*γένους βροτείου*> Grotius     10 *ἀπεῖργον* Normann: *ἀπῆγον* Sext.

# SISYPHUS(?)

## 19 (= Critias fr. 1 N)

SISYPHUS

There was a time when human life was disordered and bestial, and subservient to might;[1] when there was neither reward for good men, nor on the other hand punishment for bad. And then, I think, men established laws which were punitive, so that justice might be sovereign . . . *(a phrase missing)*[2] . . . and keep aggression in servitude; and if any man did wrong, he was punished.[3]

Then, when the laws were preventing men from doing violence openly, but they did it in secret, that was the mo-

[1] For 5th c. ideas of man's progress from chaos to order, gradually moving away from thinking it the gift of gods towards rationalizing it as man's own achievement, see e.g. W. K. C. Guthrie, *History of Greek Philosophy* III (Cambridge, 1969), 60–3 or A. J. Podlecki, *Aeschylus: Prometheus Bound* (Oxford, 2005), 16–27. [2] Perhaps 'be sovereign (over the human race)' (Grotius). [3] For law, founded upon custom and eventually codified, see e.g. Guthrie 117–31 or M. Gagarin, *Early Greek Law* (Berkeley, 1986), 51–2.

*λάθρᾳ δ' ἔπρασσον, τηνικαῦτά μοι δοκεῖ*
*< > πυκνός τις καὶ σοφὸς γνώμην ἀνὴρ*
*θεῶν δέος θνητοῖσιν ἐξευρεῖν, ὅπως*
*εἴη τι δεῖμα τοῖς κακοῖσι, κἂν λάθρᾳ*
*πράσσωσιν ἢ λέγωσιν ἢ φρονῶσί <τι>.*
*ἐντεῦθεν οὖν τὸ θεῖον εἰσηγήσατο,*
*ὡς ἔστι δαίμων ἀφθίτῳ θάλλων βίῳ*
*{νόῳ τ' ἀκούων καὶ βλέπων, φρονῶν τε καὶ*
*προσέχων τε ταῦτα καὶ φύσιν θείαν φορῶν}*
*ὃς πᾶν τὸ λεχθὲν ἐν βροτοῖς ἀκού<σ>εται,*
*<τὸ> δρώμενον δὲ πᾶν ἰδεῖν δυνήσεται·*
*'ἐὰν δὲ σὺν σιγῇ τι βουλεύῃς κακόν,*
*τοῦτ' οὐχὶ λήσει τοὺς θεούς· τὸ γὰρ φρονοῦν*
*ἔνεστι<ν αὐτοῖς>.' τούσδε τοὺς λόγους λέγων*
*διδαγμάτων ἥδιστον εἰσηγήσατο*
*ψευδεῖ καλύψας τὴν ἀλήθειαν λόγῳ.*
*ναίειν δ' ἔφασκε τοὺς θεοὺς ἐνταῦθ' ἵνα*
*μάλιστ' ἂν ἐκπλήξειεν ἀνθρώπους ἄγων,*

12 *<πρῶτον>* Enger: *<ἄγαν>* Steffen 13 *θεῶν* Wecklein, *δέος* Petit: *γνῶναι δὲ ὃς* (or *δέοση*) Sext. mss. 15 *<τι>* Scaliger 18–20 so Normann, emending Sext. (18–20) and Aet. (18) 18–19 deleted by Blaydes and Diggle, the latter obelizing *καὶ προσέχων τε ταῦτα* 19 *τε ταῦτα* Sext.: *τὰ πάντα* Grotius: *τε πάντῃ* West 21 *<τὸ>* Scaliger 24 *ἔνεστι<ν αὐτοῖς>* Heath 25 *ἥδιστον* is suspect: *κύδιστον* Haupt, Diggle: *κράτιστον* Mutschmann 27 *ναίειν* Pierson: *αἰεὶ* Sext. 28 *ἐκπλήξειεν* Grotius: *ἐξέπληξεν* Sext. *ἄγων* Sext.: *λέγων* Grotius

ment, I think, when . . . (*a word missing*) . . . some shrewdly intelligent and clever man invented[4] for mankind fear of gods, so that there might be something to frighten bad men even if they do or say or think (something) in secret. From that time therefore he introduced belief in gods— that there exists a divine power flourishing with indestructible life {and hearing and seeing with a mind, and both thinking and ?attending to? these things, and bearing a godlike nature}[5] which will hear everything that has been said among men, and will be able to see everything that is being done. 'Further, if you silently plan some evil, this will not escape the gods' notice: for there is intelligent awareness in (them).' In saying these words he introduced the most pleasant[6] of teachings, hiding the truth with words of falsity; he asserted that the gods lived in a place that would especially terrify men when he made them aware of it,[7] the

[4] The notion of a 'first inventor' for many aspects of man's material and intellectual development dates from the 5th c., e.g. Gorgias B 11a.30 DK; cf. our Introduction to *Palamedes*. In v. 12 Enger suggested 'when (first) . . . '; Steffen's 'some (too) shrewdly intelligent . . . ' adds a hint of cynicism to the 'atheistic' account which follows.
[5] Text as printed in *TrGF*, with Normann's emendation of numerous errors in Sextus and Aetius; but this is still unsatisfactory and obelized in part by Diggle. Vv. 18–19 are redundant in language, and partly duplicate v. 20, so Blaydes and Diggle deleted them.
[6] If correct, this is ironic, as is 'most glorious' (Haupt, Diggle); 'strongest' Mutschmann. [7] Lit. 'when he led (i.e. directed) them to it'; many editors reject this as flat or even corrupt. Grotius' alteration giving 'when he told them of it (cf. 24 'saying these words') is best, but not compelling.

*ὅθεν περ ἔγνω τοὺς φόβους ὄντας βροτοῖς*
*καὶ τὰς ὀνήσεις τῷ ταλαιπώρῳ βίῳ,*
*ἐκ τῆς ὕπερθε περιφορᾶς, ἵν' ἀστραπὰς*
*κατεῖδεν οὔσας, δεινὰ δὲ κτυπήματα*
*βροντῆς τό τ' ἀστερωπὸν οὐρανοῦ σέλας,*
*Χρόνου καλὸν ποίκιλμα, τέκτονος σοφοῦ,*
*ὅθεν τε λαμπρὸς ἀστέρος στείχει μύδρος*
*ὅ θ' ὑγρὸς εἰς γῆν ὄμβρος ἐκπορεύεται.*
*τοίους πέριξ ἔστησεν ἀνθρώποις φόβους,*
*δι' οὓς καλῶς τε τῷ λόγῳ κατῴκισεν*
*τὸν δαίμον' οὗτος ἐν πρέποντι χωρίῳ,*
*τὴν ἀνομίαν τε τοῖς νόμοις κατέσβεσεν*
*(some details omitted by Sextus)*
*οὕτω δὲ πρῶτον οἴομαι πεῖσαί τινα*
*θνητοὺς νομίζειν δαιμόνων εἶναι γένος.*

30 *ὀνήσεις* Musgrave: *πονήσεις* Sext. 32 *κατεῖδεν* Sext.: *κατεῖδον* Snell 33 *σέλας* Chrys.: *δέμας* Sext. 35 *ἄστερος* Sext.: *ἡλίου* Nauck, comparing Schol. on Eur. *Orestes* 982 *Εὐριπίδης μύδρον λέγει τὸν ἥλιον* 37–40 deleted by Pechstein (40 Luppe) 38–9 *τῷ λόγῳ . . . οὐκ* Sext. (*οὗτος* Diels): *τῶν λόγων . . . οὕνεκ'* Diggle

very source from which he knew they have their fears and their benefits[8] for their miserable life—from the rotating vault above them, where he observed[9] lightnings and terrible crashes of thunder, and the starry gleam[10] of heaven, the beautiful and spangled work of Time, a skilled architect, and from where the sun-star's brilliant, glowing mass[11] comes, and the wetting rain begins its way to earth. Such were the fears he established all round for mankind, and thanks to these fears this man did a fine job in his story of settling divine power in a fitting place, and quenched lawlessness with the laws.[12] . . . *(some details omitted by Sextus)* . . . In this way, I think, someone first persuaded mortal men to believe in the existence of a race of divine powers.

[8] Musgrave's 'benefits' (i.e. the sun and rain of vv. 33–6) makes a contrast with 'fears'. Sextus' 'ordeals' emphasizes men's miseries from the sky (31–3). [9] 'he observed' conveys the man's exploitation of what caused fear; 'they observed' (Snell) is matter-of-fact. [10] Chrysippus' 'gleam' is more pointed than Sextus' 'frame, structure', though the latter half-epic metaphor is not unapt for Time as a 'skilled architect' (see on *Pirithous* F 594.1–2).
[11] A metaphor from the smithy, attributed in the *Orestes* scholia to the Pre-Socratic speculator Anaxagoras' influence on Euripides (see on *Pirithous* F 593). A reference to the sun, rather than brilliant stars or comets (Diggle), suits the contrast with 'wetting rain'.
[12] Vv. 37–40 are deleted by Pechstein and Luppe as a confused and interpolated summary of vv. 1–36. Diggle tried to ease the expression, and Sextus' corrupt text, with 'he did well, for the sake of his fiction, to settle . . .'

# SISYPHUS

Pechstein 185–217; Krumeich 442–8; H. Van Looy in ed. Budé VIII.3.29–38.

Gantz 173–6; *LIMC* VII.1. 781–7b 'Sisyphos I'

*A satyr play of this name concluded Euripides' 'Trojan' trilogy of 415 B.C. (see Introductions to* Alexander *and* Palamedes*). The evidence to suggest its content is both minimal and disputed, but its chief figure must have been the notorious trickster Sisyphus (Gantz 173–6), who also appeared in one of the* Autolycus *plays (see test. *va there); cf. brief fragment F 674 below.*

*Scholars are divided on how to assign frs. 5 and 7 of P. Oxy. 2455 (the large but badly damaged collection of Euripidean narrative hypotheses in alphabetical order) among play-titles beginning with 'S'. Many scholars now give fr. 5 to* Sciron *(see test. iia there) and fr. 7 to* Sisyphus *(test. *iii below), but Pechstein 199–204 does the opposite, and others reach no decision (the debate may be followed in Van Looy 35–8). If fr. 7 does belong to* Sisyphus, *its last word 'escape' may be linked with F 673 (below), addressed to Heracles, to suggest that the play ended with his arrival to release the satyrs from the servitude which is regular in satyr plays (e.g.* Sciron *and* Syleus*). Heracles' name has accordingly been supplied in fr. 7.2—and it appears too in fr.*

*5.2, probably also as a rescuer. Because no certainly known mythical incident links Heracles and Sisyphus, however, everything is in doubt;*[1] *and even F 673 is sometimes transferred to* Syleus. *Further, a 'Homeric cup' of c. 100* B.C. (LIMC *no. 2.a) depicting Sisyphus with Autolycus, Hermes and Anticleia (all named), is referred either to our play or to* Autolycus *(test. *vb there). The play's content must therefore remain entirely speculation.*

*Brief fragment: F 674 'twisting' (a devious speaker, presumably Sisyphus: cf.* Autolycus *test. *va.3).*

*There is a further very long-lived and unresolved dispute about the play's content and nature: does the single large book fragment of a Sisyphus play assigned in whole or part in antiquity itself to both Euripides and Critias in fact stem from our play?* TrGF *1.180–2 lodges it with Critias as 43 F 19. The issue is bound up with the similarly uncertain* Pirithous: *see the Appendix at the end of this volume.*

*One or two plays called* Sisyphus *were credited to Aeschylus (probably satyric), and one to Sophocles; their content is uncertain. Comedies with his name survive in small fragments from both Greek and Roman playwrights. For Sisyphus' modern afterlife see* OGCMA *II.1008–9.*

[1] Probus on Virgil, *Georgics* 3.267–8, however, records a story that Sisyphus stole the flesh-eating horses of Diomedes when Heracles was bringing them to Eurystheus (cf. *Alcestis* 481–98, 1020–2, *Heracles* 380–8).

# ΣΙΣΥΦΟΣ

## test. *iii (Hypothesis)

*οἱ μὲ]ν οὖν σάτυροι κα[*
*]εους· Ἑρμῆς δεσθη[*
*]ων ἐπέζευξεν [*
*]φυγὼν δ' ἐντεῦθε[ν*
*]μαχόμ[ε]νος σὺν .[.].ῳ*
*ἐπι]φανεὶς δὲ τοῖς σατύροις παρ[*
*ξέπ]ληξεν αὐτούς· ὧν μὲν οἱ.[*
*]σ[..].ηθησαν εἶναι [*
*]τας ἐμπρήσειν [*
*]ς δήσειν τωκε[*
*].τους φυγεῖν [*

---

P. Oxy. 2455 fr. 7, ed. E. Turner (1962); cf. Austin, *NFE* 93, no. 17

2 Ἡρακλ]έους Barrett 7 ἐ]ξέπ]ληξεν Turner 11 το]ύτους Turner

# SISYPHUS

## test. *iii (Hypothesis)

. . . now the satyrs . . . (Heracles);[1] but Hermes . . . yoked . . . Escaping from here . . . fighting with . . . appearing to the satyrs . . . he (terrified) them. Some of them . . . to be . . . to (be about to?) burn . . . to (be about to?) bind . . . . . . (them?)[2] to escape . . . *(end of hypothesis)*

[1] Barrett supplied the name of Heracles (see Introduction); if correctly, 'Escaping etc.' may well describe him too, perhaps 'escaping' from one of his famous Labours (F 673?) and happening to pass by. [2] The satyrs (see Introduction).

673

χαίρω γέ σ', ὦ βέλτιστον Ἀλκμήνης τέκος,
<          > τόν τε μιαρὸν ἐξολωλότα.

*Etymologicum Genuinum* B (= *Etym. Magnum* p. 808.5 Gaisford) = Suda χ 174; attributed to *Syleus* by Hartung and Wilamowitz (see Introduction)

2 <ἐλθόντα> Valckenaer: <νικῶντα> West

673

I do rejoice, O most excellent son of Alcmene,[1] that you (have come?)[2] and (that?) the foul creature has been destroyed . . .

[1] Heracles (see Introduction). [2] Valckenaer's supplement reflects a statement in the fragment's source that it embodies 'a Boeotian greeting'. West prefers 'are victorious'.